

Remarks

The applicants have carefully reviewed the Advisory action dated October 16, 2007. The rejections of the claims are respectfully traversed and reconsideration is respectfully requested. In view of the forgoing amendments and the following remarks, all claims are in condition for allowance. Withdrawal of the rejections to the claims and allowance thereof are respectfully requested.

Claim 1 recites a method comprising, *inter alia*, rejecting a driver request, wherein rejecting the driver request comprises storing a protocol interface in a data structure in response to identifying a request by a driver to access an architectural protocol installed in a processor system and in response to identifying the driver request as a request associated with a violating condition of the protocol interface.

Claim 1 was rejected as unpatentable over Extensible Firmware Interface Specification (“Version102”) Blumenau et al. (US 6,993,581) (“Blumenau”). Neither of the final Office action mailed on June 22, 2007 nor the Advisory action suggests that Blumenau describes or suggests the recitations of claim 1 reproduced in the forgoing paragraph. However, the Advisory action contends that Version102 describes the installation and reinstallation of a protocol interface, which implicitly requires the storing or temporary storing of the protocol interface, a point that the applicants do not concede. The applicants respectfully submit that, as described below, the rejection of claim 1 premised on this reasoning is in error.

First, while the Advisory action (and the final Office action) contends that Version102 describes storing of a protocol interface, the Office action fails to allege that Version102 describes or suggests that such storing is performed in response to identifying a request by a driver to access an architectural protocol installed in a processor system, as is recited in claim 1. “To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness ... the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations.” (M.P.E.P. § 2143). Because the Office action fails to allege that the cited art teaches or suggests all of the recitations of claim 1, the rejection is in error and should be withdrawn.

Second, the applicants respectfully submit that the cited portions of Version102 do not describe or suggest rejecting a driver request, wherein rejecting the driver request

comprises storing a protocol interface in a data structure in response to identifying a request by a driver to access an architectural protocol installed in a processor system and in response to identifying the driver request as a request associated with a violating condition of the protocol interface. Rather, the cited portions of Version102 merely indicate that a protocol interface may be installed on a device handle. Even if the cited portions of Version102 describe storing a protocol interface in a data structure, a point that the applicants do not concede, the cited portions of Version102 do not describe that such storing is performed in response to identifying the driver request as a request associated with a violating condition of the protocol interface. Therefore, for at least this reason, claim 1 and all claims depending therefrom are in condition for allowance.

Claims 7 and 19 respectively recite a machine readable medium storing instructions, which when executed, cause a machine to, *inter alia*, reject the driver request by storing the protocol interface in a data structure in response to identifying a request by a driver to access an architectural protocol installed in the processor system and in response to identifying the driver request as a request associated with a violating condition of the protocol interface and an apparatus comprising, *inter alia*, a processor to, *inter alia*, to reject the driver request, and store the protocol interface in the data structure in response to identifying a request by a driver to access an architectural protocol installed in the processor system and in response to identifying the driver request as a request associated with a violating condition of the protocol interface. As described in conjunction with claim 1, none of Blumenau, Version102, or any combination thereof describes or suggests rejecting a driver request, wherein rejecting the driver request comprises storing a protocol interface in a data structure in response to identifying a request by a driver to access an architectural protocol installed in a processor system and in response to identifying the driver request as a request associated with a violating condition of the protocol interface. Therefore, for at least the forgoing reasons, claims 7, and 19, and any claims depending therefrom are in condition for allowance.

U.S. Serial No. 10/608,586

Response to the Advisory action of October 16, 2007

If there is any matter that the examiner would like to discuss, the examiner is invited to contact the undersigned representative at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,

HANLEY, FLIGHT & ZIMMERMAN, LLC
150 South Wacker Drive
Suite 2100
Chicago, Illinois 60606

Dated: October 22, 2007

/Michael W. Zimmerman/

Michael W. Zimmerman
Reg. No. 57,993
Agent for Applicants
312.580.1020